

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/822,940	04/13/2004	Joseph F. Bringley	87428SMR 4455		
7590 12/07/2005		EXAMINER			
Paul A. Leipold			LE, HOA T		
Patent Legal Staff			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Eastman Kodak Company 343 State Street			1773		
Rochester, NY 14650-2201			DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/822,940	BRINGLEY, JOSEPH F.	PH F.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	H. T. Le	1773	_	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 I	November 2005.			
_	is action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application	n.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-62 is/are withdra	wn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre				
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner, Note the attached Office	ACTION OF IONIN PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) All b) Some * c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documer				
2. Certified copies of the priority documer				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		ed in this National Stage		
application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		ed.		
See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	to the certified copies not receive			
Attachment(s)	_			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/822,940 Page 2

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's confirmation of the election without traverse of claims 1-44 in the reply filed on November 9, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 103

- 3. Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Ranney patent (US 6,106,866) as set forth in the last office action and further discussed below.
- 4. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the DeVoe patent (US 4,530,963) in combination with the Ranney patent (US 6,106,866) as set forth in the last office action and further discussed below.

Response to Arguments

- 5. Applicants argued that the derivatized particles taught in the Ranney patent has already included chelated iron while the claimed invention does not include such limitation. The claims employ the open claim language "comprising" which permits unspecified component even in major amount. Thus, additional component to the claimed invention is still within the claimed limitations.
- 6. Applicant further argued that the Ranney nanoparticle is intended for MRI imaging and thus serves different purpose than the claimed nanoparticle. Note that this is an

Application/Control Number: 10/822,940 Page 3

Art Unit: 1773

anticipatory rejection, the intended use of the material is not considered part of the claim limitation.

- 7. Applicant argued that some of the carriers taught in the Ranney patent include polysaccharide which is a nutrient and thus would encourage bacteria growth. The instant claims are directed to iron chelating property. Bacterial is not the material intended to be sequested by the claimed nanoparticle. Therefore, whether or not bacterial growth on the nanoparticle is not the issue. In addition, the carrier as taught by Ranney is not limited to "polysaccharide".
- 8. Applicants argued that the combination of the Ranney and DeVoe patents are improper because they are not of analogous art. The common concept between these two patents is metal chelators, especially iron, on a carrier. The teaching of Ranney provides DeVoe with carrier of nanoscale while the teaching of DeVoe provides Ranney with various highly effective metal chelators, especially iron chelators. Therefore, motivation of combining these two patents exists.
- 9. Applicant's arguments filed November 9, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Application/Control Number: 10/822,940 Page 4

Art Unit: 1773

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1511. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H. T. Le

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773